



532209

935359

ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT, INC.

FIELD INVESTIGATION TEAM

SITE INSPECTION PLAN

S.I.I. SAMP SOILS

HEAVY METALS

D→C

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

SITE: BURNS COLD FORGE CO. (Masco Industries) ID NO.: F05-8706-231
LOCATION: 9312 Arrow Rd., NW U.S. EPA NO.: OH0004213047
Minerva, OH 44657 SSID NO.: _____
(Carroll and Stark Counties) WSTS NO.: 0H0624
PLAN PREPARED BY: Tom Sullivan DATE: 7/30/87
APPROVED BY: [Signature] DATE: 8/14/87
OBJECTIVE (including description of work to be performed): Define waste
characteristics and quantities through interviewing site
representatives, taking 5 soil samples, and inspecting site.
DESIRED REPORT FORM: SI REPORT (2070-13) ✓ HRS REPORT ✓
OTHER (EXPLAIN) _____
PROPOSED DATE OF INVESTIGATION: To be determined.
BACKGROUND REVIEW: Complete: _____ Preliminary: ✓
HRS PRELIMINARY SCORE OF ROUTES: GW 0 SW 0 AIR 0
(NO FIELD WORK)
DIRECT CONTACT 0 FIRE AND EXPLOSION 0

Not responsive

WASTE TYPE(S): Liquid ✓ Solid _____ Sludge ✓ Gas _____
CHARACTERISTIC(S): Corrosive ✓ Ignitable _____ Radioactive _____ Volatile _____
Toxic ✓ Reactive _____ Unknown ✓ Other (Name) Persistent

FACILITY DESCRIPTION: Burns Cold Forge manufactures shafts, pinions, and spindles for wheels from round steel bars.

Principal Disposal Method (type and location): Waste oils and allegedly waste acids were stored in pits on-site.

Unusual Features (dike integrity, power lines, terrain, etc.): Outfall and discharge to Still Fork.

Status: (active, inactive, unknown) Facility is active but pits are inactive and have been closed. Closure method is unknown.

History: (worker or non-worker injury; complaints from public; previous agency action): On-site processes generate RCRA hazardous wastes (caustic cleaner, zinc phosphate wastes) which are regulated and monitored by RCRA programs. Site is NPDES permitted for discharge into Still Fork.

Prior to RCRA, waste oils were stored in pits outside facility (1975-78). An 8,000g tank is now used. Allegations exist that state waste acids were co-disposed of with oil in the pits. Following closure of pits saturated soils were removed to a landfill, no soil samples were taken. If waste acids were disposed in pits there may be heavy metal contamination.

C. HAZARD EVALUATION

(Use Hazard Evaluation of Chemicals sheets for specific or representative chemicals present.):

Heavy metals (lead, chromium)

Spent acids in soil.

Waste oils (cutting fluids, hydraulic oils) also in soil.

LEVEL OF PROTECTION: A ___ B ___ C ___ D ✓

MODIFICATIONS: None anticipated at this time.

SITE SAFETY PLAN ON FILE AT E & E: YES ☒ NO ☐

D. FIELD WORK REQUIRED

PERIMETER ESTABLISHMENT: MAP/SKETCH ATTACHED? YES ☒ NO ☐

Perimeter Identified? YES ☐ NO ☒

Zone(s) of Contamination Identified? YES ☐ NO ☒

Geophysical Work: YES ☐ NO ☒

Type: Magnetometry ☐ Seismic Refraction ☐ GPR ☐ Resistivity ☐ Other ☐

Comments: _____

Drilling: YES ☐ NO ☒

Well Location Identified: YES ☐ NO ☐

Drill Plan/Well Installation Plan Attached: YES ☐ NO ☐

Sampling Required: YES ☒ NO ☐

Type: GW ☐ SW ☐ Air ☐ Soil ☒ Waste ☐ Other ☐

Sampling Locations Identified: YES ☐ NO ☒

SUMMARY OF SAMPLING PROCEDURES: (Special Equipment, Facilities, or Procedures)

Soil samples from area where pits were will be collected to help define waste characteristics. Approximately 5 soil samples will be taken. If pits are completely covered soil samples should be taken at depth using split spoon or other sampling device. Standard soil sampling procedures will be followed.

E. ANALYTICAL SERVICES REQUIRED

RAS ☒

SAS ☐

CRL ☐

F. QAPP

REQUIRED: YES ☐ NO ☒

IF NO, EXPLAIN: No SAS or air samples.

G. SI WORK TEAM SIZE/LIMITATION

TEAM MEMBER

DISCIPLINE

RESPONSIBILITY

To be determined prior to site inspection.

WORK LIMITATIONS (Time of day, etc.): Work will be conducted during daylight hours only. Buddy system will be employed, team members will be monitored for exposure.

COMMENTS: If heavy metal contamination is present in soils, the

Not responsive

Surface water/sediment sampling of Still Fork is unnecessary because there is NPOES permitted discharge and an observed release to surface water would not significantly alter the score. In addition, pits were closed almost 10 years ago so contaminants may have flushed from river system had they reached Still Fork from the pits.

Groundwater sampling would not be technically feasible at this time because the closest well using the aquifer of concern is

Not responsive

